



2012 HIGHWAY SAFETY FUNDING GUIDELINES

**South Carolina Department of Public Safety
Office of Highway Safety
January 13, 2011**

**Mark A. Keel, Director
Phil Riley, Director, Office of Highway Safety**

Table of Contents

Purpose of the Funding Guidelines	3
Highway Safety Grant Cycle FFY 2012	4
Description of South Carolina's Traffic Collision Problem	5
Assistance in Developing Grant Proposals	11
Responsibilities of Funded Applicants	12
Overview and General Funding Requirements/Limitations	15
Priority Emphasis Areas Eligible for Funding in FFY 2012	21
Priority Emphasis Area Program Descriptions	22
Enforcement Projects	22
Adjudication/Prosecution Projects	26
Education/Outreach Projects	28
Criteria for Grant Application Review	30
Highway Safety Application Review Checklist	31

PURPOSE OF THE FUNDING GUIDELINES

The purpose of this manual, prepared by the Office of Highway Safety of the South Carolina Department of Public Safety, is to outline the specific criteria to be followed in the preparation of Highway Safety grant applications and to assist potential applicants in determining whether a proposed traffic safety activity is eligible for funding in Federal Fiscal Year 2012. The manual provides direction for the state's highway safety planning process and presents concise guidelines to assist state and local agencies in obtaining federal funding support for highway safety programs. Highway Safety Funds are received on an annual basis from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of the U. S. Department of Transportation.

Those interested in applying for Highway Safety funding are strongly encouraged to attend the Funding Guidelines workshop to be held January 13, 2011. Information on the registration and location of the workshop can be found on page 2 of this manual. The deadline for registering for this workshop is December 31, 2010. Please note that only the following entities are eligible for consideration for Highway Safety funding: 1) State agencies; 2) private, non-profit organizations listed as 501(c)3; 3) political subdivisions (city/county governments); and 4) State, local and federally recognized Indian tribal governments.

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2012 Highway Safety Grant Applications must be received electronically in the Office of Highway Safety by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 4, 2011. The application must be submitted to the Office of Highway Safety by 5:00 p.m. on March 4, 2011. Applications received after 5:00 pm on March 4, 2011, will not be considered. The grant application must be completed using the Office of Highway Safety's Grants Management Information System (GMIS), which is an online application process. The GMIS can be accessed through the South Carolina Department of Public Safety website at <http://www.scdps.org/ohs> beginning January 5, 2011.

The application must be fully complete and submitted via the GMIS. Supporting documents and appendices relating to the application may be uploaded as an attachment to the application on the GMIS or hard copies may be forwarded to the following address:

**Amy Caldwell, Grants Administration Manager
SC Department of Public Safety
Office of Highway Safety
Post Office Box 1993
Blythewood, SC 29016**

All supporting documents and appendices mailed in must reflect an application number and must be received in the Office of Highway Safety by 5:00 PM on March 4, 2011. The application form plus required attachments constitute the total proposal. A multi-level review process will be used to determine the approval or disapproval of grant projects submitted. Grant award announcements will be mailed shortly before the beginning of the FFY 2012 grant funding cycle, which is **October 1, 2011.**

HIGHWAY SAFETY GRANT CYCLE

FFY 2012

- December 10, 2010: Notification of Solicitation of Applications and Availability of Funding Guidelines Mailed to Potential Applicants
- December 31, 2010: Deadline for Registering for OHS Funding Guidelines Workshops. **Please contact Ms. Glenda Millaudon of the Office of Highway Safety at (803) 896-9965 or toll free at 1-877-349-7187 by no later than 5:00 pm on December 31, 2010, to register for the Highway Safety Funding Guidelines workshop. Seating is limited.**
- January 7, 2011: Posting of FFY 2012 Highway Safety Funding Guidelines on the SC Department of Public Safety's web site: www.scdps.org/ohs/
- January 13, 2011:** Highway Safety Funding Guidelines Workshop for Grant Applicants at the following location and time:
- 1:00 - 4:00 pm at the SC Department of Archives and History Center, 8301 Parklane Rd, Columbia, SC
- March 4, 2011: 5:00 p.m. Due Date for Grant Applications. In order to be considered for funding, all grant applications **must** be received **electronically in the Office of Highway Safety by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 4, 2011. Applications received after 5:00 pm on March 4, 2011, will not be considered. The grant application must be completed using the Office of Highway Safety's Grants Management Information System (GMIS), which is an online application process. The GMIS can be accessed through the South Carolina Department of Public Safety website at www.scdps.org/ohs.**
- Late September 2011: FFY 2012 Grant Awards Issued with Funding Beginning October 1, 2011. Notification of Applicants Not Approved for Funding

DESCRIPTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA'S TRAFFIC COLLISION PROBLEM

Statistics based on 2009 calendar year (CY) (01/01/09-12/31/09) Preliminary Data:

The latest statistics for South Carolina indicate that during 2009, an estimated 106,842 traffic collisions were reported; this is a 0.4% decrease from 2008 totals when 107,252 collisions were reported. Collisions in CY 2009 resulted in 894 fatalities and 48,181 injuries. The number of traffic deaths was 2.9% lower than in 2008, when 921 persons were fatally injured in South Carolina traffic collisions. The estimated economic loss to the state from traffic crashes in 2008 was \$2.71 billion, and is estimated to fall to \$2.66 billion in 2009. This total, however, does not reflect the human toll of pain and suffering.

Mileage Death Rate: The state's mileage death rate (MDR), traffic fatalities per 100 million miles of travel in 2009 was 1.84. The national mileage death rate in 2009 was 1.13. Based on these figures, South Carolina's mileage death rate was 62% higher than the national average in 2009. The MDR for 2009 was an historic low and a 1.0% decrease from 2008.

2009 Preliminary Collision Statistics: Breaking collision statistics down by time in CY 2009 indicated the following:

- * 1 Traffic Collision was reported every 4.9 minutes.
- * 1 Traffic Death was reported every 9.8 hours.
- * 1 Non-fatal Traffic Injury was reported every 10.9 minutes.
- * 1 Property-Damage-Only Collision was reported every 7.0 minutes.

In 2009, South Carolina had 3,343,014 licensed drivers who operated 3,906,300 registered motor vehicles on a roadway system of 66,262 miles of streets and highways. South Carolina has the fifth largest state-maintained highway system in the nation.

DUI Involvement in Collisions: According to NHTSA statistics for 2009, driving under the influence of alcohol (BAC =.08 or more) resulted in the deaths of 377 persons. State level Statistics for 2009 indicate that 5,426 DUI (alcohol and/or drugs) collisions were reported with more than 3,800 persons injured. Of the 5,426 total DUI collisions, 7% were fatal crashes, 46% were injury crashes, and 47% were property-damage-only crashes. In 2009, the state experienced a 1% decrease in the number of alcohol-related crashes as compared to 2008.

Speed Involvement in Collisions: According to NHTSA statistics for 2009, the number of speeding related fatalities fell to 337 from 350 in 2008. State level statistics for 2009 indicate that 1,884 speed/too fast for conditions crashes were reported, with 1,189 persons injured. In 2009, the state experienced an 8.1% decrease in speed/too fast for conditions crashes when compared to 2008.

Five Year Collision Data: In order to examine traffic collision trends over time, Office of Highway Safety staff reviewed collision data for the period 2005-2009. During this five-year period, the state's MDR of 2.21 in 2005 fell to an historic low of 1.84 in 2009. Collision statistics for the period are presented in the chart below.

**South Carolina Collision Statistics
2005 - 2009**

<u>Year</u>	<u># Collisions</u>	<u># Deaths</u>	<u># Injuries</u>	<u>Death Rate</u>
2005	111,983	1,094	49,841	2.21
2006	112,949	1,045	50,144	2.08
2007	112,067	1,077	49,262	2.11
2008	107,252	921	46,925	1.86
2009	106,842	894	48,181	1.84

Top Contributing Factors for CY 2009 Crashes

Injury Crashes:

- * Driving Too Fast for Conditions
- * Failure to Yield Right of Way
- * Driver Distraction/Inattention
- * Disregarding Sign/Signal Driving
- * Under the Influence of Alcohol/Drugs

Fatal Crashes:

- * Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol/Drugs
- * Driving Too Fast for Conditions
- * Running off Road
- * Exceeded Speed Limit
- * Failure to Yield Right of Way

Total Crashes:

- * Driving Too Fast for Conditions
- * Failure to Yield Right of Way
- * Driver Distraction/Inattention
- * Following Too Closely
- * Improper Lane Usage/Change

Location of Highest Numbers of Property-Damage-Only Crashes: During the five-year period from 2005-2009, the five counties with the highest number of property-damage-only collisions were Greenville, Charleston, Richland, Horry, and Spartanburg.

Location of Highest Numbers of Injury Crashes: The locations of the largest numbers of injury collisions during the five-year period 2005-2009 were Charleston, Greenville, Richland, Horry, and Spartanburg counties.

Location of Highest Numbers of Fatal Crashes: The locations of the largest numbers of fatal crashes during the five-year period 2005-2009 were Greenville, Horry, Charleston, Richland, and Spartanburg counties.

Driver Groups Involved in Crashes: During the five-year period, the age groups with the highest number of drivers involved in crashes included drivers ages 15-24 and 25-34. Drivers under the age of twenty-one continued to be over-represented in traffic crashes based on the size of the category of licensed drivers in this group. Males continued to be involved in a higher percentage and number of crashes than female drivers.

An Analysis by the Office of Highway Safety: Based on traffic data over a three-year period, the charts on pages 8-10 show counties in the state of South Carolina which lead the state in statistical categories regarding fatal and severe injury crashes (number fatal and severe injury, number speed-related, percentage speed-related, number DUI relates, and percentage DUI related). Grant projects submitted for FFY 2012 impacting counties listed and ranked in the tables, which lead in the above-referenced statistical categories, will be given priority for federal funding.

All Fatal And Severe Injury Collisions South Carolina 2007 - 2009

COUNTY					
Abbeville	29:34	18:41	25:34	72:35	36.0
Aiken	126:10	106:12	117:10	349:10	10.5
Allendale	5:46	10:45	10:45	25:46	45.5
Anderson	168:7	146:7	168:5	482:7	6.5
Bamberg	17:43	13:43	17:42	47:43	42.8
Barnwell	28:35	25:35	24:35	77:33	34.5
Beaufort	109:12	108:11	84:14	301:13	12.5
Berkeley	175:6	154:6	161:6	490:6	6.0
Calhoun	15:44	12:44	17:42	44:44	43.5
Charleston	388:1	321:1	255:1	964:1	1.0
Cherokee	60:25	58:22	49:23	167:23	23.3
Chester	28:35	40:28	32:33	100:31	31.8
Chesterfield	42:29	47:23	37:29	126:27	27.0
Clarendon	41:30	38:29	45:27	124:29	28.8
Colleton	81:18	83:14	80:16	244:17	16.3
Darlington	64:22	63:20	53:22	180:21	21.3
Dillon	19:41	30:33	19:40	68:40	38.5
Dorchester	102:14	105:13	99:12	306:12	12.8
Edgefield	22:39	32:32	14:44	68:40	38.8
Fairfield	33:31	23:38	21:38	77:33	35.0
Florence	115:11	117:10	108:11	340:11	10.8
Georgetown	72:20	46:25	49:23	167:23	22.8
Greenville	287:3	243:3	254:2	784:3	2.8
Greenwood	57:26	63:20	70:19	190:20	21.3
Hampton	33:31	20:39	19:40	72:35	36.3
Horry	345:2	273:2	249:3	867:2	2.3
Jasper	64:22	45:26	46:25	155:25	24.5
Kershaw	66:21	47:23	57:21	170:22	21.8
Lancaster	84:17	77:19	68:20	229:19	18.8
Laurens	79:19	79:17	74:18	232:18	18.0
Lee	19:41	19:40	34:32	72:35	37.0
Lexington	165:8	144:8	133:8	442:8	8.0
McCormick	13:45	9:46	9:46	31:45	45.5
Marion	33:31	18:41	35:31	86:32	33.8
Marlboro	25:37	24:37	23:36	72:35	36.3
Newberry	46:27	35:31	36:30	117:30	29.5
Oconee	63:24	45:26	38:28	146:26	26.0
Orangeburg	106:13	80:16	95:13	281:14	14.0
Pickens	88:15	79:17	81:15	248:15	15.5
Richland	270:4	220:4	222:4	712:4	4.0
Saluda	20:40	25:35	22:37	67:42	38.5
Spartanburg	205:5	172:5	142:7	519:5	5.5
Sumter	85:16	81:15	79:17	245:16	16.0
Union	25:37	26:34	21:38	72:35	36.0
Williamsburg	44:28	36:30	46:25	126:27	27.5
York	163:9	132:9	127:9	422:9	9.0
Total	4,124	3,587	3,464	11,175	

County names in red are ranked in the top 15 in the above categories 3 or more times.

Fatal & Severe Injury DUI Crashes

South Carolina 2007 - 2009

COUNTY	2007 RANK	2008 RANK	2009 RANK	2007 to 2009 RANK	ALL to 09 RANK	% DUI 07 - 09 RANK	Average Rank
Abbeville	10:29	5:37	5:36	20:36	72:35	27.8%:17	31.7
Aiken							
Allendale	0:46	4:39	2:42	6:44	25:46	24.0%:27	40.7
Anderson						27.4%:18	
Bamberg	3:41	2:44	4:40	9:43	47:43	19.1%:39	41.7
Barnwell	7:35	9:27	10:30	26:32	77:33		27.5
Beaufort	17:21	19:17	14:24	50:22		16.6%:43	23.3
Berkeley						22.9%:31	
Calhoun	8:33	3:41	5:36	16:39	44:44		32.7
Charleston						13.4%:44	
Cherokee	17:21	14:23	14:24	45:23	167:23	26.9%:20	22.3
Chester	10:29	13:24	11:28	34:26	100:31		24.2
Chesterfield	7:35	9:27	12:27	28:29	126:27	22.2%:32	29.5
Clarendon	12:27	8:30	9:32	29:28	124:29	23.4%:28	29.0
Colleton	13:26	19:17	24:24	56:19	244:17	23.0%:30	20.7
Darlington			18:21	65:17	180:21		
Dillon	3:41	6:35	5:36	14:40	68:40	20.6%:36	38.0
Dorchester	19:19		23:17	63:18		20.6%:36	19.5
Edgefield	9:32	7:32	2:42	18:37	68:40	26.5%:23	34.3
Fairfield	10:29	5:37	9:32	24:33	77:33		28.8
Florence						27.1%:19	
Georgetown	19:19	9:27	16:23	44:24	167:23	26.3%:24	23.3
Greenville						24.9%:25	
Greenwood	15:24	12:25	17:22	44:24	190:20	23.2%:29	24.0
Hampton	7:35	3:41	3:41	13:41	72:35	18.1%:40	38.8
Horry						21.2%:35	
Jasper	14:25	8:30	5:36	27:31	155:25	17.4%:42	31.5
Kershaw		17:20			170:22		
Lancaster	20:18	17:20	19:20	56:19	229:19	24.5%:26	20.3
Laurens			22:18		232:18		
Lee	5:38	7:32	10:30	22:34	72:35		30.0
Lexington							
McCormick	2:45	1:46	1:45	4:46	31:45	12.9%:45	45.3
Marion	3:41	3:41	11:28	17:38	86:32	19.8%:38	36.3
Marlboro	3:41	2:44	1:45	6:44	72:35	8.3%:46	42.5
Newberry	12:27	12:25	9:32	33:27	117:30	28.2%:16	26.2
Oconee		15:22	14:24	52:21	146:26		18.8
Orangeburg							
Pickens	17:21						
Richland						22.1%:34	
Saluda	4:39	6:35	2:42	12:42	67:42	17.9%:41	40.2
Spartanburg							
Sumter		19:17		66:16	245:16	26.9%:21	16.7
Union	8:33	7:32	7:35	22:34	72:35		30.0
Williamsburg	4:39	4:39	20:19	28:29	126:27	22.2%:32	30.8
York						26.5%:22	
Total	981	913	924	2,818	11,175	25.2%	

County names in red are ranked in the top 15 in the above categories 4 or more times.

Speed/Too Fast For Conditions Fatal & Severe Injury Crashes

South Carolina 2007 - 2009

COUNTY	2007 N K	R A N K	2008 N K	R A N K	2009 N K	R A N K	07 to 09 N K	R A N K	ALL Fatal & Severe Crashes 07 to 09 N K	R A N K	% Speed Related 07 - 09 N K	R A N K	Average Rank
Abbeville	10	35	10	34	12	29	32	31	72	35	44.4%	5	28.2
Aiken	43	10	27	17	48	7	118	9	349	10	33.8%	29	13.7
Allendale	2	46	6	44	4	46	12	46	25	46	48.0%	3	38.5
Anderson	79	5	58	6	59	4	196	5	482	7	40.7%	10	6.2
Bamberg	7	40	4	46	8	36	19	43	47	43	40.4%	11	36.5
Barnwell	13	33	9	37	8	36	30	33	77	33	39.0%	16	31.3
Beaufort	36	13	36	9	15	27	87	16	301	13	28.9%	41	19.8
Berkeley	55	7	42	8	49	6	146	7	490	6	29.8%	38	12.0
Calhoun	6	42	5	45	5	42	16	44	44	44	36.4%	26	40.5
Charleston	100	3	76	1	51	5	227	4	964	1	23.5%	46	10.0
Cherokee	22	25	21	21	20	19	63	23	167	23	37.7%	21	22.0
Chester	10	35	11	32	10	31	31	32	100	31	31.0%	36	32.8
Chesterfield	18	29	21	21	16	24	55	27	126	27	43.7%	7	22.5
Clarendon	16	30	21	21	20	19	57	25	124	29	46.0%	4	21.3
Colleton	28	18	34	12	23	18	85	17	244	17	34.8%	28	18.3
Darlington	22	25	27	17	20	19	69	21	180	21	38.3%	19	20.3
Dillon	7	40	11	32	7	39	25	41	68	40	36.8%	25	36.2
Dorchester	33	14	32	15	37	11	102	12	306	12	33.3%	31	15.8
Edgefield	11	34	13	30	5	42	29	35	68	40	42.6%	9	31.7
Fairfield	14	31	10	34	6	41	30	33	77	33	39.0%	16	31.3
Florence	32	15	34	12	30	15	96	15	340	11	28.2%	42	18.3
Georgetown	24	21	15	29	10	31	49	29	167	23	29.3%	39	28.7
Greenville	101	2	66	3	69	3	236	3	784	3	30.1%	37	8.5
Greenwood	25	20	19	26	28	17	72	20	190	20	37.9%	20	20.5
Hampton	14	31	8	40	5	42	27	38	72	35	37.5%	23	34.8
Horry	107	1	73	2	71	2	251	1	867	2	29.0%	40	8.0
Jasper	19	27	13	30	7	39	39	30	155	25	25.2%	45	32.7
Kershaw	31	16	23	20	20	19	74	19	170	22	43.5%	8	17.3
Lancaster	24	21	27	17	29	16	80	18	229	19	34.9%	27	19.7
Laurens	37	11	33	14	32	13	102	12	232	18	44.0%	6	12.3
Lee	6	42	7	42	16	24	29	35	72	35	40.3%	12	31.7
Lexington	48	8	35	11	33	12	116	10	442	8	26.2%	44	15.5
McCormick	4	44	7	42	5	42	16	44	31	45	51.6%	1	36.3
Marion	9	37	9	37	9	33	27	38	86	32	31.4%	33	35.0
Marlboro	8	39	10	34	9	33	27	38	72	35	37.5%	23	33.7
Newberry	24	21	20	25	16	24	60	24	117	30	51.3%	2	21.0
Oconee	28	18	19	26	9	33	56	26	146	26	38.4%	18	24.5
Orangeburg	31	16	36	9	39	10	106	11	281	14	37.7%	22	13.7
Pickens	37	11	28	16	32	13	97	14	248	15	39.1%	15	14.0
Richland	89	4	63	4	87	1	239	2	712	4	33.6%	30	7.5
Saluda	4	44	9	37	8	36	21	42	67	42	31.3%	34	39.2
Spartanburg	66	6	63	4	40	8	169	6	519	5	32.6%	32	10.2
Sumter	24	21	21	21	20	19	65	22	245	16	26.5%	43	23.7
Union	9	37	8	40	12	29	29	35	72	35	40.3%	12	31.3
Williamsburg	19	27	17	28	14	28	50	28	126	27	39.7%	14	25.3
York	47	9	44	7	40	8	131	8	422	9	31.0%	35	12.7
Total	1,399		1,181		1,113		3,693		11,175		33.0%		

County names in red are ranked in the top 15 in the above categories 4 or more times.

ASSISTANCE IN DEVELOPING GRANT PROPOSALS

Research Assistance

Applicants are encouraged to visit the following web sites for a wealth of research information (including, but not limited to, crash statistics) for developing Highway Safety grant applications:

- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA): www.nhtsa.dot.gov
- Statistical Services Section of the SC Department of Public Safety's Office of Highway Safety: www.scdps.org/ohs/stat_services.asp

While a list of eligible projects has been provided in the individual program areas outlined in the remainder of this manual, applicants are encouraged to visit the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's (NHTSA) web site for ideas and specific examples of other projects that have been successfully implemented in other states. These projects are outlined in NHTSA's Traffic Safety Digest section of its web page. Funding consideration may be given for such projects in South Carolina. The web address is: www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/outreach/safedige/

Assistance from Office of Highway Safety

Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Office of Highway Safety (OHS) for assistance and guidance in completing and submitting grant applications (e.g., forming appropriate project goals, objectives, evaluation measures, etc.). Listed below are contact names and program area(s) of expertise. OHS staff can be reached toll free at 1-877-349-7187.

Stuart Litman: Police Traffic Services/Speed Enforcement

Cothea Scott: Impaired Driving Countermeasures

Dr. Ed Harmon: Traffic Records

Amie Hudson: Occupant Protection, Pedestrian Safety, Two-wheel Vehicle Safety

Daphne Shook: Questions regarding the completion of the budget pages (pp. 1 – 5 of the Highway Safety Grant Application)

All other questions can be directed to Amy Caldwell, Grants Administration Manager of OHS.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF FUNDED APPLICANTS

When a project is funded, the authorized official of the recipient agency enters into a written contractual agreement with the Department that outlines specific responsibilities. A few conditions of the agreement are:

Reporting Requirements

- Progress Reports –programmatic (due February 1st, May 1st, and August 1st)
- A Final Narrative Report (due November 1st)

Claims

Claims for reimbursement are to be submitted on designated forms as issued by the SC Department of Public Safety, Office of Grants Accounting. Claims may be submitted no more than once each month and no less than once a quarter; however, claims are held if the grant recipient is delinquent in the submission of required reports. Failure to submit claims as required may result in project termination.

Procurement

Proper bidding procedures as required by OMB Circular A-102, Attachment O, or OMB Circular A-110 (as applicable) are to be followed. In addition,

- * Bid specifications/requests for proposals for purchases over \$10,000 must be reviewed and approved by Office of Highway Safety staff prior to issuance; once bids/proposals are received, subgrantees must submit bids/proposals for review and approval prior to acceptance of any bid.
- * All contracts for services must be submitted for review and approval prior to execution. **Only under exceptional circumstances are sole source contracts approved.**
- * Purchases in excess of \$10,000 in the unit or aggregate and requiring approval of specifications/bid awards must be submitted through the standard approval process prior to August 1 of the grant year.
- * All grant-funded purchases must be requested, purchased, and invoiced on or before September 30. As such, any purchases made under this grant must be documented with purchase requisitions/purchase orders dated on or before September 30.

Agencies failing to follow these procedures will not receive reimbursement for such procurements. Purchases for items, which are on a state contract, do not require prior approval, unless they have a value of \$5,000 or more. An item with a value of \$5,000 or more must be approved by NHTSA prior to beginning the purchasing process. Recipient agency staff should verify contract dates, however, prior to purchase, to ensure that the contract is in existence at the time of purchase and includes both the contract number and expiration date on documentation submitted when reimbursement is requested.

Written Requests

- * Requests for grant revisions after a grant is awarded must be made in writing to the Office of Highway Safety prior to the implementation of the change. Revisions cannot be implemented until written approval is granted by the Office of Highway Safety. Retroactive approval of revisions will not be granted, and costs incurred in such situations will not be reimbursed.
- * Specific out-of-state travel not identified in the Travel Section of the approved grant application budget must receive prior written approval from the Office of Highway Safety. Without such approval, costs for the travel will not be reimbursed.

Personnel

- * Time sheets must be maintained for all grant-funded personnel, reflecting the hours worked on and charged to the project. If personnel are funded 100% through the grant, their activity must be 100% in support of activities agreed upon in the grant award. Costs for grant-funded personnel performing tasks outside the grant will not be reimbursed.
- * All personnel funded under a grant must be identified by name and date of hire. Any changes in grant personnel, reassignments, or terminations must be reported in writing. Costs for personnel services may only be reimbursed for work performed within the dates of hire. Work performed prior to the documented hire date or after the documented termination date under the grant cannot be reimbursed. Personnel costs can only be reimbursed for personnel specifically identified in the approved grant budget. If the budget specifies, for example, one (1) traffic officer at 100%, reimbursement of personnel expenses cannot be made for two officers, each working 20 hours of a 40-hour shift. Reimbursement can only be made for the one officer.

Special Activities

- * All agencies receiving Highway Safety Grant funds will be expected to assist the Office of Highway Safety in promoting the observance of National Child Passenger Safety Week (September); Buckle Up, America! Week (May); Drunk and Drugged Driving (3D) Prevention Month (December) as requested; all agencies receiving Highway Safety Grant funds will also participate in the statewide safety belt and DUI enforcement and public information and education campaigns and the Law Enforcement Network.

Equipment Purchased with Grant Funds

- * All equipment purchased with Highway Safety grant funds must be used for the originally authorized grant purposes for as long as needed for those purposes. Agencies receiving funds to purchase equipment must notify the Office of Highway Safety and request disposition instructions when (1) equipment becomes obsolete, and the agency desires to sell or dispose of the equipment; or (2) the equipment is no longer needed for the original purpose. No disposition of property can be made by the subgrantee until written instructions are provided by the Office of Highway Safety.
- * Property Control records must be submitted for all equipment purchased with Highway Safety funds. The equipment is subject to a biennial property inventory to verify use in accordance with the original grant-funded activities.

OVERVIEW AND GENERAL FUNDING REQUIREMENTS/LIMITATIONS

The Office of Highway Safety of the South Carolina Department of Public Safety is charged with the administration of highway safety programs throughout the state. Highway safety programs in South Carolina originated under the Highway Safety Act of 1966 and have promoted safety in a variety of areas through state and local projects. This guide provides an overview of each of the areas eligible for federal funding during the FFY 2012 funding cycle.

The following program guidelines and list of fundable items have been developed to focus federal funding assistance in those areas that have a maximum probability of reducing death and injury on the highways. The approved program areas were selected on the basis of the magnitude of identified problems, the impact of existing countermeasures, and the potential for further impact on specific problems. To be eligible for federal funds, each traffic safety problem must be substantiated through appropriate data analysis, and the proposed solutions must possess a potential for impact.

General Requirements:

All proposals submitted should demonstrate:

1. A highway safety problem/need exists;
2. A measurable impact on highway and traffic safety;
3. Cost effectiveness;
4. A comprehensive and systematic approach implemented in a well-defined geographic area;
5. A method for project evaluation (both performance and impact evaluation); and
6. All cost items are an integral part of an approved highway safety program and have been justified accordingly.

Special Note Regarding Supplanting:

The replacement of routine and/or existing State or local expenditures with the use of Federal grant funds and/or the use of Federal grant funds for costs of activities that constitute general expenses required to carry out the overall responsibilities of a State or local agency is considered to be supplanting and is not allowable.

General Allowable Costs:

To be allowable, an applicant's costs must be necessary, reasonable, allocable, and used in accordance with appropriate statutes and implementing grant regulations. Highway Safety grant funds are to be used to support state problem identification, planning and implementation of a program to address a wide range of highway safety problems that are related to human factors and the roadway environment and which contribute to the reduction of crashes, deaths, and injuries.

1. The following are some examples of eligible items for Highway Safety grant funding:
 - * Implementation of educational and promotional efforts to increase public compliance with occupant protection laws.
 - * Implementation of a comprehensive enforcement program for detecting, investigating, arresting, and convicting impaired drivers.
 - * Development and administration of countermeasures programs to correct identified problems.
 - * Program coordination for impaired driving prevention public information and education activities.
 - * Necessary mission-related equipment, training and travel.
 - * Program management and administration.
 - * Evaluation of the effectiveness of program or project improvements.
 - * The cost of training is allowable using DOT/NHTSA developed, equivalent, or endorsed curriculums.
 - * Purchase of child restraint devices is allowable if they are in compliance with NHTSA performance standard FMVSS #213 for these devices.
 - * Development costs of new training curriculum and materials are allowable if they will not duplicate materials already developed for similar purposes by DOT/NHTSA or by other states. This does not preclude modifications of present materials necessary to meet particular state and local instructional needs.
2. Costs are allowable for highway safety consultant services from universities, public agencies, non-government organizations and individuals for State or local highway safety support services or products consistent with the applicable OMB Circular, provided applicable State procurement purchasing procedures are followed.
3. Costs are allowable to support a specific highway safety project with educational activities that offer specific educational items and/or appropriate printed materials. Documentation must be available to show that such activities do not violate State law. Educational items, activities, and any printed materials must directly relate to the project objectives.
4. Costs of meetings and conferences, where the primary purpose is the documentable dissemination of technical information, are allowable including meals, transportation, rental of meeting facilities, and other incidental costs.

Specific Examples of Allowable/Non-Allowable Costs:

The provisions stated in the following sections are not intended to deny flexibility in supporting potential traffic collision and injury reduction activities; however, the conditions do serve as a guide in describing costs that **are allowable or not allowable for highway safety funding.**

1. Personnel

Grant-funded personnel are allowable and must expend 100% of their time in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the activities specified in the approved grant application. Grant-funded traffic officers, for example, are provided to increase the level of traffic law enforcement in a jurisdiction. As such, they are prohibited from providing funeral escorts or parade duty. In addition, since the primary function of grant funded-officers is to prevent and reduce collisions, injuries and fatalities by proactive enforcement measures, these officers should only respond to traffic collisions **in emergency situations**, such as when no other officer is available to respond, or during inclement weather when proactive enforcement is hindered. Special DUI prosecutors are provided solely for the purpose of increasing DUI and other dangerous driving case convictions and relieving the backlog of such cases; they are prohibited from prosecuting or handling other cases, such as burglary, aggravated assault, etc., while they are grant funded.

2. Facilities

- a. The cost of land is not allowable.
- b. The cost of construction or reconstruction of driving ranges, towers, and skid pads is not allowable.
- c. The cost of construction, rehabilitation, remodeling, or office furnishings and fixtures for state, local, or private buildings or structures is not allowable. The following are some examples of those items considered as furnishings or fixtures, for which costs are not allowable:

Desk	Coat Rack	Floor Covering	Picture/Clock
Chair	Credenza	Storage Cabinet	Draperies
Table	Book Case	Portable Partition	Fixed Lighting
Filing Cabinet	Shelving	Office Planter Lamp	

3. Equipment

- a. Costs for major (\$5,000 or more) equipment purchases require specific prior approval of NHTSA.
- b. Costs shall be allocated and pro-rated based on utilization for highway safety purposes where major multi-purpose equipment is a planned purchase.
- c. Purchase of the following equipment items is allowable only if they are part of a comprehensive traffic enforcement program:

- 1. Vehicle Light Bar Package, 8-light strobe, takedown lights

2. Vehicle Passenger Transportation Cage or Safety Barrier for use between front seat and back seat to prevent rear seat occupants from injuring law enforcement front seat occupants
3. Vehicle Mobile Radio Unit
4. In-Car Mobile Video Unit
5. Videotapes for in-car video unit
6. Power Control Center
7. Hand-held radar units/LIDAR units. Devices must meet federal standards.
8. Siren-Speaker
9. Traffic Cones (SCDOT specification -Not to exceed \$25 each)
10. Push Bumpers
11. Fire Extinguishers
12. Electronic Siren
13. Cellular Phone-Basic Service
14. Passive alcohol sensors
15. Stop sticks
16. Police vehicle (not to exceed \$24,000) – **Please note that vehicles must be color schemed and marked as indicated by the Office of Highway Safety.**
17. Alcohol testing devices (Devices must be on the Conforming Product List issued by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the International Association of Chiefs of Police.)
 - d. Purchase of mainframe computers is not allowable.
 - e. Purchase of weapons, uniforms, and badges is not allowable.
 - f. Purchase of Mobile Data Terminals is not allowed at this time.

4. Travel

- a. The cost of international travel is not allowable, except as separately approved by NHTSA and the state.

- b. The Office of Highway Safety must approve all requests for out-of-state travel in writing and in advance, unless the specific travel destination has been previously approved and is specifically listed in the Travel section of the approved application budget.
- c. The cost of day-to-day patrol mileage for a grant-funded officer is allowable based on the approved grant mileage rate.

5. Training

- a. Costs are allowable to pay for a grant-funded employee's salary while pursuing OHS approved training.
- b. **The purchase of portable alcohol breath testing devices is allowable, but the devices may be used only in a training context.**

6. Alcohol Treatment Services

The cost of counseling and other alcohol and drug abuse treatment services, the cost of the promotion of such services, and the cost of any materials related to treatment services are not allowable.

Letters of Support:

Letters of support are requested with the grant application *only* if funds are requested for multi-agency traffic enforcement projects and other projects involving multiple partners.

Matching Requirements:

Grant applications are 100% federally funded for FFY 2012. No cash match is required for any eligible applicant.

Limitations of Federal Funding:

Federal funding is limited to the support of new highway safety activities or the upgrading/expansion of established highway safety activities, or continuation of projects having a statewide impact.

Grant applications are 100% federally funded for FFY 2012. It should be noted that in FFY 2012 **no cash match is required** for any eligible applicant.

However, as in previous years, grant projects are awarded on a year-to-year basis. Grant projects showing significant progress in improving highway safety *may* be renewed up to two additional years, for a total of three years of funding. After three years of continuous funding, subgrantees are expected to assume the entire cost of sustaining the project. **The exception to this involves projects that the OHS deems necessary to recommend funding in order to complement or support statewide enforcement, training, and/or public information and education campaign efforts and which show high levels of performance and effectiveness.**

Indirect Cost Rates:

State Agencies: All indirect cost recoveries should be credited to the general fund with the exception of recoveries from research and student-aid grants and contracts. Each state agency receiving grants or contracts to which indirect costs may be charged must have an approved indirect cost rate. Agencies must prepare an indirect cost proposal, and submit it to the State Indirect Cost Officer for review and approval. The OHS reserves the right to negotiate indirect cost rate charges to a grant prior to award.

Local Agencies and Private, Non-Profit Organizations: Local agencies and Private, Non-Profit Organizations receiving federal funds are not authorized to recover indirect costs.

PRIORITY EMPHASIS AREAS ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING IN FFY 2012

Impaired Driving Countermeasures: The enforcement, adjudication, education, and systematic improvements necessary to impact impaired driving. This includes programs focusing on youth alcohol traffic safety issues.

Occupant Protection: The development and implementation of programs designed to increase usage of safety belts among all age groups and proper usage of child restraints.

Police Traffic Services: The development or enhancement of traffic enforcement programs necessary to directly impact traffic crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Speeding programs are a priority; however, these programs should also include attention to DUI enforcement, occupant protection and other traffic violations. Components of grant proposals may also include efforts to educate and improve the driving skills, attitudes and behaviors of young drivers, ages 15-24.

Other Potential Funding Areas

Other program areas may be eligible for funding in FFY 2012 which include Motorcycle Safety, Traffic Records and Pedestrian Safety. Please contact Amy Caldwell of the Office of Highway Safety at 1-877-349-7187 for information on applying for a grant in potential funding areas.

PRIORITY EMPHASIS AREA PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS

The following projects are eligible for funding in FFY 2012:

1. Specialized DUI Enforcement Unit/Team

In order for impaired driving enforcement programs to be considered for funding, state and local crash data and traffic records analyses must be available to fully justify the requirement for an impaired driving enforcement team. Jurisdictions must have a high incidence of alcohol and/or drug-related crashes or a significant increase over the previous year in order to justify a proposal. Collision data and analyses, along with citation data, should be used to clearly indicate a major impaired driving problem and to demonstrate that increased enforcement will have a major impact on the reduction of drug and/or alcohol-related traffic crashes. The traffic officers assigned to such programs must be highly trained and skilled in order to detect a potential DUI. They must be able to administer proper field sobriety tests, videotape the suspect, supervise administration of the breath test during booking proceedings, and provide adequate case documentation for court presentation.

Proposals for either statewide or community Impaired Driving Enforcement Programs must:

- a. Describe your department's traffic records data information system;
- b. Describe how the enforcement effort will be initiated to increase DUI arrests and to reduce alcohol/drug-related crashes, to include an enforcement plan detailing specific days/nights of the week and hours the specialized impaired driving enforcement will be conducted. Provide an enforcement plan and a sample monthly schedule of the grant-funded officers;
- c. List the enforcement tools, such as video equipment, needed to implement the project and cost projections. Explain how these tools will be utilized in furthering project objectives;
- d. Demonstrate/discuss the department's commitment to the program. Include a detailed description as to how the department intends to provide continuing support, both programmatic and financial, after the end of the grant period;
- e. Describe the public information and educational program to be implemented as a part of the program. Such a program should focus on the risks of drinking and driving and the likelihood of apprehension through the program. These programs should focus on certain groups that

have been identified as being at high-risk for driving under the influence (i.e., males ages 25 - 34) and repeat offenders;

- f. Describe the need for this specialized program, based on the number of DUI-related crashes, injuries, and fatalities now occurring in the area to be covered by the program; and
- g. Demonstrate and document the increase in manpower and man hours planned for impaired driving enforcement.
- h. Include a plan for SFST training for enforcement and supervisory personnel assigned to the project, including the number of officers to be trained and the anticipated results.

2. Establishment/Enhancement of Traffic Enforcement Division

In order for traffic enforcement proposals to be considered for funding, state and local crash data and traffic records analyses must be available to fully justify the requirement for increased traffic enforcement. Jurisdictions must have a high incidence of crashes or a significant increase over the previous year in order to justify a proposal. Collision data and analyses, along with citation data, should be used to clearly indicate a major problem and to demonstrate that increased enforcement will have a major impact on the reduction of traffic crashes.

- a. Provide traffic records, citations or arrest data, and other information to adequately identify a traffic problem;
- b. Develop a plan for increased training for all traffic officers, including the type of training, the number to be trained, and the anticipated results;
- c. The purchase of equipment will not be considered unless the equipment is required to develop a new traffic enforcement unit, to improve an on-going traffic enforcement program, or to support a statewide enforcement campaign. **Refer to Pages 17-18 of this document for a sample listing of allowable equipment.** Support equipment required to implement an enforcement program must be fully justified and must have a direct effect upon the apprehension and conviction of traffic offenders.
- d. Describe how a public information program will be initiated/implemented to inform the general public of the program, to provide them with basic traffic safety education, and to secure support for the increased enforcement effort;
- e. Demonstrate and document a need to increase personnel hours for traffic enforcement;
- f. Demonstrate/discuss the department's commitment (and that of the city/county/state governing body) to a comprehensive traffic enforcement program;

- g. Demonstrate a well developed, comprehensive plan for enforcement including specific days of the week and hours the selective traffic enforcement will be conducted. Provide a sample monthly schedule for the grant-funded officer(s); and
- h. Provide and establish specific objectives that are clear, achievable, measurable, and time-specific. These statements must reflect the activities needed to fully implement the project. Be sure that enforcement goals are achievable, taking into account factors such as manpower constraints and seasonal population fluctuations. Include any other tasks that are relevant to achieving Project Goals.
- i. Priority will be given to those agencies actively participating in the South Carolina Law Enforcement Network (SCLN). Agencies applying for and receiving funding for police traffic services/speed enforcement programs must agree to continue or begin participation in the SCLN.
- j. All applications should address how funding will serve to decrease the number of collisions, injuries, and fatalities in respective jurisdictions through increased enforcement and educational efforts. Subgrantees funded for traffic safety enforcement units must ensure that the level of enforcement for traffic-related offenses is increased above and beyond enforcement levels experienced prior to the establishment of the grant-funded unit.
- k. All police traffic services/speed enforcement programs must include educational, media, and training components to support the enforcement program.

3. Selective Traffic Enforcement Program

Selective traffic enforcement programs should follow established traffic enforcement methods in which personnel and equipment are concentrated at high collision locations. To maximize effectiveness, selective enforcement must be based on accurate data and data analysis; therefore, adequate traffic records must be maintained in order to justify the use of valuable personnel and equipment resources at the selected sites. Traffic records data provided in the grant application must contain a minimum of three years of data regarding the number and types of crashes that occurred, the violations and citation data for various traffic offenses, and the locations of collisions/traffic arrests. Crash records and citation data must provide such vital information as time of day; day of week; weather conditions and roadway conditions; and number of speed, DUI, safety belt, and child restraint citations issued. This data, when properly analyzed, can be used to identify the locations to which and the times when a selective traffic enforcement program should be deployed. In developing a selective traffic enforcement program on either a statewide or community level, applicants must:

- a. Demonstrate how traffic collision, citation and other related data will be used in the deployment of personnel;

- b. Provide a plan for the training of the traffic supervisor and the traffic officers assigned to the project;
- c. Provide information about the program to local judges and magistrates to acquaint them with the need for increased enforcement;
- d. Discuss a method, including both qualitative and quantitative components, for determining the outcome and effectiveness of the selective traffic enforcement program;
- e. Include an appropriate and aggressive public information component to educate the public as to the program's purpose and to encourage its support for increased traffic enforcement to address the identified problems;
- f. Indicate that support for increased traffic enforcement has been received from the city/county governing bodies and that the traffic program has the approval of all command level personnel within the department. The proposal should discuss the department's commitment to a comprehensive selective traffic enforcement program;
- g. Demonstrate and document an increase in manpower and man-hours for selective traffic enforcement; and
- h. Provide a comprehensive plan to alleviate, through selective traffic enforcement, the identified state or community traffic safety problem. The plan should include specific days of the week and hours the selective traffic enforcement will be conducted. Provide a sample monthly schedule for the grant-funded officer(s).

AJUDICATION / PROSECUTION PROJECTS

The following projects are eligible for funding in FFY 2012:

1. Special DUI Prosecutors for Local Areas

The goal of this project category is to increase the conviction rate of DUI offenders in judicial circuits where there exists a backlog of DUI cases. Project applications requesting to provide funding for a special DUI prosecutor in each judicial circuit must:

- a. Provide the number of *nolle prosequere* cases, or the number of cases dismissed over the past three years, and the average age of these cases;
- b. Outline DUI-related training to be provided for the assigned prosecutor;
- c. Establish special goals for increasing the conviction rate of DUI offenders and for decreasing the DUI case backlog;
- d. Discuss how the project will be evaluated;
- e. Discuss how DUI cases are currently being handled with existing staff;
- f. Provide a sound approach for project implementation; and
- g. Provide the conviction rate for the previous three years, by county, in the judicial circuit.

2. Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor

A Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) project would provide critical support to enhance the capability of the States' prosecutors and law enforcement to effectively prosecute traffic safety violations. Proposals for projects that establish a Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor must:

- a. Assess training needs, and develop and provide training programs for prosecutors, law enforcement officers, and other traffic safety professionals with an emphasis on the effective prosecution of impaired driving cases;
- b. Provide technical assistance and legal research to prosecutors on a wide variety of legal issues, including probable cause; Standardized Field Sobriety Testing (SFST); implied consent; breath/blood testing; accusatory instruments; pre-trial procedures; trial practice; and appellate practice;
- c. Serve as a resource to prosecutors in the State on impaired driving and other traffic cases;

- d. Prepare briefs, legal memoranda and other pleadings for use at hearings, trials or on appeal of such cases;
- e. Train and provide technical assistance to State, local and county law enforcement in methods of evidence gathering, especially newly emerging technology and trial techniques, which will improve the ability of prosecutors to effectively prosecute impaired driving cases;
- f. Coordinate with the Office of Highway Safety to serve as the liaison with additional prosecutors to enable them to become more involved in traffic safety initiatives;
- g. Respond to written and verbal inquiries made by prosecutors concerning criminal law, associate administrative issues, procedure or special problems, and offer competency and expertise in providing a broad range of technical assistance and support services for prosecuting traffic safety offenses;
- h. Meet regularly with law enforcement agencies to explain prosecutorial policy, answer questions, and receive suggestions; foster improved law enforcement/prosecutor cooperation; strengthen effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies; and regularly apprise prosecuting attorneys on evolving areas of traffic safety law;
- i. Serve as a regular and full participant in the State's Impaired Driving Prevention Council.
- j. Provide consultation on and prosecute, or serve as second chair on, difficult impaired driving cases at various locations around the State.

EDUCATION/OUTREACH PROJECTS

1. Education for Young People

Projects with a specific focus on young drivers ages 15-24 with education on alcohol and/or drugs, safety belt usage, and speeding will be given consideration. Educational projects are more focused on the young drivers and provide a longer exposure to the alcohol/drug and highway safety messaging than public awareness (media) campaigns. Educational projects could include the conducting of mock DUI trials in schools, the conducting of actual DUI trials in high schools and the implementation of victim impact panels. Parameters for an educational program include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Projects must accurately define the focus population. Young (15 - 24 years old) drivers or young people who have not yet reached driving age are appropriate groups, or both;
- b. Projects must specify a methodology for reaching the defined population. The methodologies designed should clearly outline the manner in which the group will be accessed and the projected number to be impacted by the project;
- c. Projects eligible for funding should be located in school districts, colleges, universities, and city or county agencies that deal with safety education or recreation;
- d. Educational projects should provide in-depth education to a specific population, measuring and evaluating that impact; and
- e. Applicants should identify in their proposal what existing highway safety education is now being done in the community by other organizations (MADD, SADD, ENCARE, etc.) and within the school system.

2. Statewide Occupant Protection Training and Outreach Program

A need exists to implement community projects that include minority groups, rural populations and young drivers, to encourage and promote safety belt and passive restraint use. Priority will be given to community-wide initiatives using innovative and creative approaches to encourage/promote the proper use of occupant restraints and to increase usage rates. While limited public information and education efforts may be a component of a community safety belt project, the primary focus should not be media centered.

Schools are an important arena in which to reach students, parents and others who transport students. Studies have indicated that children can be very influential in promoting safety belt usage in families. Studies have also shown that teenagers and young males are over-represented in fatal and injury crashes. Traditionally, belt usage rates among these groups have been low.

Projects in this category should be comprehensive in scope to include the medical and business community in promoting highway safety in the schools. Projects should also be educational or promotional programs designed to measurably increase usage of safety belts among this population group. Projects should also focus on entire school districts involving students, parents, teachers, and administrators and should be tied into all school activities.

3. Specialized Training for Law Enforcement (Statewide)

Projects in this category should provide comprehensive traffic safety training to law enforcement personnel throughout the state. Law enforcement training projects should include:

- a. The focus group to be trained;
- b. The learning goals and objectives of the training;
- c. A method for measuring the effectiveness of the training;
- d. The ultimate impact on traffic collisions, deaths, and injuries;
- e. A narrative of the methodology to be used in the training; and
- f. A course outline of information to be covered.

CRITERIA FOR GRANT APPLICATION REVIEW

Applications for proposed highway safety activities from qualified applicants will be reviewed by Office of Highway Safety (OHS) staff in accordance with the review criteria listed below. Recommendations by the OHS staff will then be forwarded to the SC Public Safety Coordinating Council for its review/approval pursuant to Section 23-6-520, SC Code of Laws, 1976, as amended. Applications for funding will be reviewed on the following basis:

1. The degree to which the proposal addresses a national or state identified problem area. Priority consideration will be given to applicants proposing major alcohol countermeasures, motorcycle safety, occupant protection, pedestrian safety, speed enforcement, and traffic records programs within the counties identified previously as having the highest numbers and percentages of alcohol and/or speed-related traffic collisions, deaths, and injuries during the last three years.
2. The extent to which the proposal meets the published criteria within the specific guidelines.
3. The degree to which the applicant identifies, analyzes, and comprehends the local or state problems. **Applicants who do not demonstrate a traffic safety problem/need will not be considered for funding.**
4. The extent to which the proposal seeks to provide a realistic and comprehensive approach toward problem solution, including documenting coordination with local and State agencies necessary for successful implementation.
5. The assignment of specific and measurable objectives with performance indicators capable of assessing project activity.
6. The extent to which the estimated cost justifies the anticipated results.
7. The ability of the proposed efforts to generate additional identifiable highway safety activity in the program area; the ability of the applicant to become self-sufficient and to continue project efforts once federal funds are no longer available.
8. The ability of the applicant to successfully implement the project based on the agency's past experience in implementing similar projects; the capability of the agency to provide necessary administrative support to the project.
9. For continuation projects, the quality of work and the responsiveness to grant requirements demonstrated in past funding years; current or past grant performance, results of past monitoring visits, and the timeliness and thoroughness of required reports.